DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 694 FL 012 934

AUTHOR McGarrell, Hedy M.
TITLE Language Testing--A Historical Perspective.
INSTITUTION Public Service Commission of Canada, Ottawa (Ontario).
PUB DATE Dec 81
NOTE 25p.
JOURNAL CIT Medium; v6 n4 p17-40 Dec 1981

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Applied Linguistics; *Audiolingual Methods; *Communicative Competence (Languages); Educational Objectives; *Grammar Translation Method; *Language Tests; Notional Functional Syllabi; Psycholinguistics; *Second Language Instruction; Sociolinguistics; Teaching Methods; *Testing

ABSTRACT

Three major stages in the development of language testing have been identified and correlated with corresponding stages in teaching. These are: (1) the pre-scientific stage associated with the grammar-translation method; (2) the psychometric-structuralist stage concomitant with the audio-lingual method; and (3) the integrative-sociometric stage which goes along with recent communicative methods. The three trends are discussed in terms of views of language and learning, language teaching and the learner, testing, and strengths and weaknesses of each approach. The study shows the progression from lack of concern for statistical information and no accounting for validity, reliability, or objectivity in the pre-scientific stages through an atomistic approach towards language that concentrated on form, towards an integrative or global approach that concentrates on meaning. This third trend calls for testing instruments that allow an assessment of the learners' communicative competence. It would seem that a large number of tests will have to be developed if they are to evaluate different learners' communicative competence and if they are based on the learners' communicative needs. (AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

MEDIUM, vol 6 no 4 December 1981
Public Service Commission of Canada

LANGUAGE TESTING - A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Hedy M. McGarrell is a Ph.D. student in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Ottawa. She can be reached in Ottawa at (613) 231-5461.

ED217694

This paper* offers a brief historical overview of language testing, especially in the North American context, during the twentieth century. Such testing has always been closely related to teaching. Accordingly, it would be difficult to consider language testing apart from the teaching or learning process. Upshur (1969) noted that trends in language testing have tended to follow trends in language teaching, which in turn have tended to follow trends in linguistics. Frequently, there is a lag between the development of a new paradigm in linguistic theory and its subsequent application in language teaching and its exploitation in testing. Some teaching methods which were developed under the influence of a supposedly new approach are tested by the methods from the previous doctrine.

The twentieth century has seen a number of rival approaches to teaching and testing come and go, and often "...the dogma of one movement has become the heresy of the next." (Morrow 1977). However, Spolsky (1969, 1975) isolated three major stages in the development of language testing:

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Hedy M. McGarrell
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

- the pre-scientific (mainly prior to World War II)
- the psychometric-structuralist (beginning in the late 1940s)
- the integrative-sociolinguistic (recent)

While these stages follow in the order given, they overlap both in time and approach. The integrative-sociolinguistic trend shows evidence of elements characteristic of the pre-scientific trend, while the psychometric-structuralist and the integrative-sociolinguistic trends co-exist to some extent. The individual trends have not replaced each other; rather, the effect has been cumulative. Elements of all three trends can be found in language testing material today. The purpose of this paper is to discuss

FL012934

* I would like to thank P.C. Hauptman and M.B. Wesche for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

the three trends identified by Spolsky (1969) in terms of the prevailing views of

- language and learning
- language teaching
- language testing

This organization permits an appreciation of how a number of disciplines other than linguistics (e.g. psychology, pedagogy, sociology) contribute towards the theoretical basis of the various testing trends discussed. A short outline of the major strengths and weaknesses of each trend concludes each of the three sections.

1. The pre-scientific trend

The trend in testing referred to as "pre-scientific" (Spolsky 1969) is most apparent within the framework of the grammar-translation approach towards language teaching.

1.1 Views of language and learning

This trend is based on the traditional humanistic orientation, which places primary importance on the literature of a country. It satisfies the predominant mental-faculties school of thought that regards language learning as a way to train the mind. No relationship between a language and the environment is seen to exist. For this reason Davies (1968) labelled the theory evident in the grammar-translation approach the "strict-separatist" view. Language is thought of primarily as an object of study in itself and as such it is strictly separated from its use in society.

1.2 Language teaching and the learner

Chastain (1976) isolated the following primary aims of language teaching within the grammar-translation approach:

- to prepare the learners to undertake exhaustive studies of the literature of the target language
- to encourage learners to have a deeper understanding of their native language
- to develop the learners' minds through practice in dealing with difficult learning situations and materials.

To attain these objectives, learners in the grammar-translation program typically memorize vocabulary and deductively-taught rules of grammar. These rules, their exceptions, various regularities and irregularities, are all discussed at length in the students' native language. Kelly (1969:55) observed that the grammar-translation approach expects the learner "...to be able to sort out from his grammar the rules like those of his own language and distinguish them from others."

The content of courses based on the grammar-translation approach is based on a grammatical progression. This progression, including both grammatical structures and vocabulary, is arbitrarily selected by the individual course designer. French verbs ending in "-er", for example, are considered less difficult than those ending in "-ir". Consequently, the former are taught before the latter. Such gradation in the presentation of material can be traced back to the early 16th century scholar, Comenius (Kelly 1969). Teaching materials using such gradation are still available today.

1.3 Testing

Testing within the framework of the pre-scientific trend is characterized by a total lack of concern for statistical information. There is no accounting for validity, reliability, or objectivity. Testing is considered to be the responsibility of the individual teacher, who sets his or her own standards and criteria.

Tests tend to require translation, composition or sentence-completion type exercises. They are usually written and open-ended in format. Oral examinations of any type are rarely used.

1.4 Strengths of the pre-scientific trend

Testing techniques advocated during the pre-scientific trend allow global evaluation of the learner's ability in the target language. Essay writing and similar activities require learners to synthesize their knowledge and to produce utterances in the target language.

1.5 Weaknesses of the pre-scientific trend

The testing techniques used during the pre-scientific trend have been criticized on the basis of several shortcomings. From the outline presented above, the following major problems became apparent:

(a) Lack of theoretical foundations:

No real linguistic or psychological or other theoretical foundations are presented to justify the various translation and grammar activities. It is assumed that these are the essence of learning another language.

(b) Subjectivity:

Scoring, evaluation and grading systems are subjective (Pilliner 1952), and it is difficult to assess students' ability in a systematic and objective manner. Examiners' personal prejudices and interference from stylistic considerations are likely to affect marking.

(c) Limited objectives:

The narrow view of language predominant under the pre-scientific trend in testing entails limited objectives for language testing and teaching.

(d) Examiner training:

Language testing is entirely the teachers' responsibility. No specific training is required for language testing. Accordingly, the criteria used vary considerably. Some teachers put the emphasis on grammatical precision (according to the examples set by well-known literary authors), while others are more concerned with style or creativity.

2. The psychometric-structuralist trend

The psychometric-structuralist trend in language testing is most apparent within the audio-lingual approach to language teaching, including Audio-Lingual Method (ALM), mimicry-memorization (MIM-MEM), Oral-Aural.

2.1 Views of language and learning

Language and language learning are viewed as basically simple processes that lend themselves easily to empirical investigation and description. Views of language and language learning are greatly influenced by behaviourism in psychology and stucturalist theories in linguistics. Under these influences, learning theory (e.g., Skinner 1957, Quine 1960) maintains that learning is shaped and consists of conditioned responses to stimuli from the environment. Applied to language learning, this view results in what Davies (1968) called the "separate but equal" view of language, where the correct language response has to be associated with the correct stimulus from the environment. Mastery of a language is expected to be best achieved through mastery of what structuralism considers its constituent components. Moulton (1961) summed up the then prevailing attitudes to language in the form of the following slogans: language is a set of habits; language is speech not writing; language is what people say, not what they ought to say; languages are different.

2.2 Language teaching and the learner

The implications of the ideas expressed in Moulton's slogans provided ideal conditions for what came to be known as the audio-lingual approach to language teaching and learning. Behaviour modification to achieve automaticity of response and structural pattern practice became the most important classroom activities. Politzer (1964:149) confirmed:

> **"...behaviourism and formal analysis of language were the chief features of the linguistic impact on language instruction."**

and Valette (1966:132) concurred:

> **"The new curriculum materials have been devised on the assumption that foreign-language learning is basically a mechanical process of habit formation."**

Characteristics of audio-lingual methods include:

- Rules are taught inductively. The meaning of utterances is secondary to a precise formulation of every pattern. Brooks (1960:40) confirmed:

  "The single paramount fact about language learning is that it concerns, not problem solving, but the formation and performance of habits."

- Learning problems are anticipated and identified through contrastive analyses between the learners' mother tongue and the target language.

- The learners' mother tongue is not used in the classroom. The observation that languages are different (Moulton 1961) leads to the assumption that nothing but interference can be expected from the learners' mother tongue.

- Memorization of dialogues, pattern drills, and structural pattern practice form the basis of language teaching influenced by theories such as those advocated by Lado and Fries. Learners are expected to gain automaticity of response to a given stimulus.[1]

2.3 Testing

Language testing takes on a new direction under the influence of two sets of experts:

(a) The psychologists; their concern for the development of "objective" measures in educational measurement led to the application of statistical techniques in an effort to achieve reliability and validity.

(b) The linguists; their concern with the lack of linguistic principles in language testing led to "the structural linguists' approach to testing" (Spolsky 1978: vii).

The contribution of psychology to the psychometric-structural trend in testing includes the development and painstaking standardization of short-term, multi-choice tests. Such tests meet the demands for potentially objective, reliable, and valid measuring instruments. The paramount importance of these criteria is evident in statements such as:

> **"... the shape of all tests, whether predictive or non-predictive, language or non-language, is primarily determined by the need to test the tests for reliability and validity. That is why, for instance, the multiple choice technique of answering is so common." (Ingram 1968:74)**

The new developments in language testing based on a psychometric approach appeared to have at least two shortcomings:

- the new tests tended to use a written format, which limited their field of application somewhat
- the selection of items was not based on any new theory of language learning and teaching, nor did it seem to have any foundation in theoretical linguistics.

Agard and Dunkel (1948) were among the first to draw attention to the potential practical deficiencies of the new testing techniques. They pointed out that, despite increased emphasis on aural-oral skills, there were no suitable tests to evaluate these skills. Similar criticisms were voiced by Carroll (1952, 1953) in reviews of developments in the field of language testing.

The linguistic side of the theoretical foundation for the psychometric-structural trend in language testing developed out of Lado's (1950) doctoral dissertation. In his conclusion he stated that:

- a great lag exists in measurement in English as a foreign language (i.e., new developments in testing and testing theories were not supported by new developments in linguistic theory)
- the lag is connected with unscientific views of language
- the science of language should be used in defining what to teach.

Lado further specified procedures to be followed to apply linguistic theory to the development of foreign language tests. Close to ten years later, Lados's (1961) refined ideas concerning language testing were published in what Spolsky (1978) has called "a classic exposition of the structural linguist's approach to testing". Constructing language tests could now be considered a science. Strict

procedures had to be followed and intuition and proficiency in the target language were no longer a sufficient qualification for test designers.

The linguists' understanding of the nature of language became paramount in setting the specifications for tests, which theoretically were to be based on the contrastive analysis hypothesis.

Lado's approach to testing received support from contemporary developments in linguistics and psychology on a theoretical as well as on a practical level. On a theoretical level the majority of linguists and psychologists agreed that language learning consisted of the formation of a new set of habits in the learner.[2] On a practical level, test designers needed long lists of short items to be sampled and tested objectively. Structural linguists were able to deliver such items readily. Thus, this practice resulted in "discrete structure point" items (Carroll 1961). Carroll, one of Lado's early supporters, explained:

> **"The work of Lado and other language testing specialists has correctly pointed to the desirability of testing for very specific items of language knowledge and skill, judiciously sampled from the usually enormous pool of possible items. This makes for highly reliable and valid testing." (Carroll 1961, quoted in Spolsky 1978:vii)**

Thus short-item, multiple-choice, discrete-point tests became the most common form of evaluation within the psychometric-structuralist trend. Such tests typically consist of a selection (to be made by the examinee) of correct forms or items among a number of possible replies (i.e., the distractor items). Discrete-point testing items are usually aimed at testing one point of grammar at a time (e.g., one point of morphology or syntax). Students rarely need to understand whole sentences to answer discrete-point items correctly. Not all multiple-choice tests are necessarily discrete-point tests but, according to contemporary theory, only discrete-point tests can tell exactly where the individual learner went wrong.

2.4 Strengths of the psychometric-structuralist trend

The type of testing techniques advocated by Lado and his supporters allow the development of tests that conform to high standards of reliability and validity. In addition, the tests are relatively economical and easy to administer. Large numbers of students can be tested simultaneously. Scoring and evaluation of tests is mechanical and can be left to machines. These characteristics encouraged the development of several standardized tests for the evaluation of student progress and program success. For example:

- Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL)
- MLA Foreign Language Test for Teachers and Advanced Students
- Graduate Record Examinations Advanced Tests in various languages
- Michigan Proficiency Test Battery

Several of these tests have been in use for many years, although some of them have undergone modifications to allow, at least in part, for changing views about language and learning.

Lado's views on language testing (1961) have profoundly influenced subsequent testing techniques. The concepts of statistical validity and reliability have become prerequisite to language testing and directly quantifiable modes of asessment are sought even by Lado's opponents.

2.5 Weaknesses of the psychometric-structuralist trend

Tests developed to conform to theories of the psychometric-structuralist trend have been criticized for a number of reasons. General theorists (for example, Hamp 1968, Di Pietro 1971) as well as researchers involved in the development of second language tests (Upshur 1962) have attacked Lado's premise that a contrastive analysis is central to language testing. The psychometric-structuralist approach to test design relies on the assumption that knowledge of the individual elements of a language is equivalent to knowledge of the language. In recent years it has become increasingly obvious that knowledge of the elements of language is insufficient. Learners are often unable to synthesize their knowledge in order to meet the linguistic demands of language use.

Robinson (1973) identified at least three areas, where "objectively" designed tests seem inferior to tests from the pre-scientific trend in the sense that they limit the students' role in the test.

- Students produce little or no language, often they are limited to the selection of alternative answers.
- Tests from the pre-scientific trend usually test the learners' ability to produce language. Objective tests usually assess the students' ability to recognize correct forms.
- In a subjective test (such as presence within a grammar-translation framework), the learner is able to use his own norms of language. In an objective test (such as advocated by proponents of the audio-lingual approach), the learner has to base his replies on the language norms of the test designer, giving no indication of how he would evaluate a particular situation with regard to contextual factors.

The preceding discussion indicates that test designers have adopted an over-restrictive view of the type of language to be evaluated in order to increase reliability of the tests. Davies (1978) called this the "reliability-validity tension." Furthermore, the over-restrictive view has resulted in decontextualized language tests that are generally far removed from life-like language.

3. The integrative-sociolinguistic trend

This trend in language testing is most apparent in cognitive and especially functional approaches to language teaching and testing. It developed out of increasingly strong and numerous attacks on the principles of the contrastive analysis underlying the psychometric-structuralist trend in language testing. Carroll (1961), after having described the discrete-point approach, also identified some of its shortcomings. He then argued in favour of what he called an "integrative" approach, where the "total communicative effect of an utterance" would be taken into consideration. He provided a clear statement of an "integrated" position a few years later:

> "... since the use of language in ordinary situations calls upon all these aspects [of language], we must further recognize that linguistic performance also involves the individual's capability of mobilizing his linguistic competences and performance abilities in an integrated way, i.e., in the understanding, speaking, reading or writing of connected discourse." (Carroll 1968:58)

This position is in fact inconsistent with an atomistic approach to language (e.g. audio-lingual) as a basis for testing. Integrative testing requires a global view of language that runs counter to Lado's fundamental assumptions mentioned above. However, as far as Carroll was concerned, there was no conflict. He felt that global performance should be tested in addition to individual elements, thus mobilizing all the elements of a particular language.[3]

3.1. Views of language and learning

The integrative-sociolinguistic trend is influenced mainly by developments in psycholinguistics and in sociolinguistics.

3.1.1 Psycholinguistic aspect

The psycholinguistic aspect is based on Chomskyan linguistic theory. Chomsky's view of language is fundamentally contrary to that underlying the psychometric-structuralist trend. Chomsky pointed out the creative element in language. The infinite number of possible sentences in a language makes it impossible for any one native speaker to produce all the feasible and grammatical sentences of a language within his lifespan. Applied to the second-language learning situation, Chomsky's position on first-language acquisition called for a reconsideration of the principles supporting the psychometric-structuralist trend in language testing[4]. Accordingly, second-language learners are unlikely to reach the goal of native-speaker ability on the basis of the behaviouristic habit-formation theory and the structuralists' atomistic perception of language. Chomsky postulated the existence of "innate ideas" in every human being and an underlying rule system for every language (in addition to the existence of linguistic universals). The internalization of underlying rule systems is seen as the key to successful language learning by proponents of Chomsky's theory.

The fact that a considerable number of psychologists abandoned behaviourism in favour of congitive learning theories has further influenced the integrative-sociolinguistic trend in language testing. Cognitive psychologists do not view cognitive learning as external, mechanistic processes but as a meaningful mentalistic process in which the learners play a central role. Ausubel (1968), for example, strongly rejected behaviourism, criticizing

> **"... the prevailing tendency ... for educational-psychologists to extrapolate findings from animal, rote, and perceptual-motor learning experiments ..." (p. ix)**

He claimed that

> **"The acquisition of large bodies of knowledge is simply impossible in the absence of meaningful learning." (Ausubel 1967:11)**

According to Ausubel, cognitive theory regards the human nervous system as a data-processing and storing mechanism, where new ideas and information can be meaningfully learned and retained. This however, occurs

> **"... only to the extent that they are relatable to already available concepts or propositions which provide ideational anchorage." (Ausubel 1967:11)**

Carroll (1961:101-102) referred to the influence of these developments in psychological theory on language learning theory as "cognitive-code learning theory" as opposed to the "audiolingual habit theory".

> **"The cognitive-code learning theory may be thought of as a modified, up-to-date grammar translation theory ... Learning a language is a process of acquiring conscious control of the phonological, grammatical and lexical patterns of a second language, largely through study and analysis of these patterns as a body of knowledge. The theory attaches more importance to learner's understanding of the structure of the foreign language than to his facility**

> in using that structure, since it is believed that provided the student has a proper degree of cognitive control over the structures of the language, facility will develop automatically with use of the language in meaningful situations."

A more cognitive approach to language learning theory has led to the perception of language learning as a progressive evolution of transitional stages of knowledge toward a model of competence. Language learning is seen as a process of gradual internalization of rules.

3.1.2 Sociolinguistic aspect

While the first aspect of the integrative-sociolinguistic trend owes much to the influence of Chomsky and of cognitive psychology, the second is, at least in part, a reaction to the failure of Chomskyan linguistic theory to deal with the complexity of language behaviour much more satisfactorily than the theories it replaced. The sociolinguistic aspect is centered around the argument that knowing a language involves more than the knowledge of a code. It involves the language user's ability to use the language in context. A language learner should be tested for his ability to communicate, to use linguistic elements appropriately. Chomsky's theory, however, does not allow for an account of sociolinguistic factors. Hymes (1972:277) proposed to broaden the scope of Chomsky's competence/performance dichotomy. He explained:

> "We have then to account for the fact that a normal child acquires knowledge of sentences, not only as grammatical, but also as appropriate. He or she acquires competence as to when to speak, when not, and as to what to talk about with whom, when, where, in what manner. In short, a child becomes able to accomplish a repertoire of speech acts, to take part in speech events, and to evaluate their accomplishment by others."

Hymes further pointed out that the social context of a message is as important as its linguistic context. Missing the cultural cues of a message may, in many cases, be synonymous with missing the message entirely.

3.2 Language teaching and the learner

Whereas audiolingual habit theory tries to discourage the learner from comparing the target language with his mother tongue, the cognitive-code theory favours careful explanations of differences between the two languages involved. Under the influence of the cognitive approach to language teaching, the learner is encouraged to acquire conscious control of the target language. The learner is expected to reach a point at which he is able to formulate his own replies to previously unheard utterances. One of the most important tenets of the cognitive approach to language teaching is that learning should be meaningful to the learner. Chastain (1976) has stated:

> **"The students should understand at all times what they are being asked to do. They should understand at all times what they are saying, writing, reading, and hearing. New material should be organized to relate to knowledge that the students already have about their own language, the second language learned to that point in the course, and their concepts about the world about them." (p. 147)**

Paulston (1974) has related Hymes' arguments to the actual second-language teaching situation. She has shown that communicative competence, and with it the sociolinguistic trend in language testing, reflects important aspects of knowing a language. Paulston's arguments imply that teachers need to do more than simply describe the target language. They should teach learners what else native speakers do when they communicate. To this effect, Kettering (1974) has described a number of cultural and social tasks (for example hiding/showing feelings through excuses, compliments, complaints) and how they can be incorporated into teaching situations.

The integrative-sociolinguistic trend in language testing is characterized by teaching methods which are no longer organized in terms of grammatical features. There are few methods that could be considered truly "cognitive" (but see Dialogue Canada II, Part II).

A desire to render language learning more efficient has resulted in teaching methods organized in terms of features derived from language use. The communicative needs of the learner can be determined by predicting the type of situations in which he will most likely need to function. This allows the syllabus designer and the materials writer to present the learner with language appropriate to his own particular needs. A considerable amount of work is in progress in this area. Wilkins (1976) has outlined the categories for a proposed "notional syllabus." Munby (1978) has outlined a scheme that allows an elaborate specification of the learners' target communicative needs. The Council of Europe's Modern Languages Project has stimulated a number of specifications of a "threshold" level of language proficiency, i.e., the learners' needs (Coste et al. 1976, Council of Europe 1973 and 1979, Richterich and Chancerel 1978, Roulet 1976, Trim 1980, Van Ek 1975, 1976, 1980 to name but a few). The above developments in psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics have also led to renewed interest in experiential and instrumental approaches to second language teaching such as immersion programs (e.g. Lambert and Tucker 1972, Macnamara 1966 and 1973, Newmark 1971, Newmark & Zeibel 1968, Savignon 1972, and others). Several syllabuses for "specific purposes" have been designed (see, for example, British Council 1979, Cowan 1977, Robinson 1980). Language teaching has thus become learner-centered in its aim to meet learners' communicative needs.

3.3 Testing

The integrative-sociolinguistic trend in language testing marks a shift of emphasis from linguistic accuracy to functional ability. Tests reflect the problem-solving approach towards language teaching (e.g. Chastain 1976). They are expected to reveal what underlying rules the learner has internalized and how they deviate, at a given point in time, from the way they are used by native speakers. Corder (1967) called this stage the learners' "transitional competence," which enables them to comprehend and produce utterances within the scope of their "interlanguage" (Selinker 1972). Corder (1967) advocated techniques that give learners an opportunity to form and test their own hypotheses about the target language and to receive position feedback from their errors. In addition, the concepts of reliability and validity, central to test construction under the influence of the psychometric-structuralist trend (Valette 1967, Harris 1969, Clark 1972) are still of considerable importance.

The integrative-sociolinguistic trend in language testing calls for testing instruments that allow an assessment of the learners' communicative competence. Prevailing theory requires an evaluation of the learners' ability to comprehend and produce utterances that are both situationally and contextually appropriate. To satisfy this condition, a number of different tests are proposed, for example: oral interviews, cloze tests, dictations, and essay writing. The most frequently used testing techniques seem to be cloze and dictation and updated versions of TOEFL and Michigan tests.

3.4 Strengths of the integrative-sociolinguistic trend

Testing techniques advocated under the integrative-sociolinguistic trend show some similarity with tests used under the prescientific trend. The more recent trend, however, requires tests to be objective, valid and reliable (although for tests to be practicable some concessions have to be made). The integrative-sociolinguistic trend in language testing encourages tests that are judged to be life-like and meaningful to the learner.

3.5 Weaknesses of the integrative-sociolinguistic trend

There are several problems involved in the design and administration of tests that conform to the objectives outlined above. Some of these problems are:

- The target of the tests, communicative competence, is still not clearly defined. Some researchers take it as synonymous to "native speaker competence," while others use it to indicate a "minimum" ability in the second language and some use it in yet another context.
- Tests evaluating global skills in a life-like situation are likely to be time-consuming and expensive if a worthwhile level of objectivity, reliability, and validity is to be achieved.
- Any testing situation is likely to be artificial. It is not clear, in fact, how learners' ability to handle a testing situation is related to real-life performance.

- Another difficulty is that testing learners' linguistic reaction to disappointment, surprise, anger etc., as the motivation for communicating these feelings is artificial in testing situations.

The few problems outlined above serve to indicate that large-scale standardized tests (as developed under the influence of the psychometric-structuralist trend) are difficult, if not impossible, to develop within the framework of the integrative-sociolinguistic trend. In fact, the tenet that tests be based on learners' communicative needs implies that a large number of different tests has to be developed to serve a small number of learners (rather than a few tests to evaluate a large number of students, e.g. TOEFL, Michigan).

Summary and Conclusions

This paper discussed three major trends in second/foreign language testing, i.e.,

- the pre-scientific trend
- the psychometric-structuralist trend
- the integrative-sociolinguistic trend

Close connections between testing techniques used, views of language, learning and teaching were shown to exist.

A study of the development of language testing during the twentieth century shows that the last few years have witnessed a shift away from an atomistic approach towards language that concentrates on form, towards an integrative or global approach that concentrates on meaning. This trend brings with it a number of new problems. Some of these problems are of an administrative nature, e.g., regarding economy of time and resources in testing procedures. Other problems are of a more theoretical nature (e.g., the level of validity and reliability, standardization, generalizability of results). Appropriate solutions to these and other problems will have to be provided before the most recent trend in language testing can be considered satisfactory.

FOOTNOTES

1 Second or subsequent editions of audiolingual texts tend to have adopted a more eclectic approach, combining meaningful learning, elements of cognition, and habit formation.

2 Some linguists were developing ideas along very different lines. Chomsky (1965) published a theory that is fundamentally opposed to the linguistic theory on which Lado's work is based.

3 More recently researchers have taken into consideration that the sum of the parts of language is not equal to the total.

4 Chomsky (1966) questioned the value of studies in linguistic theory for studies in second-language acquisition.

5 It is, however, by no means clear that these tests actually assess the language user's "communicative competence" (see, for example, Morrow 1977, 1980).

REFERENCES

ACARD, F.B. and H.B. Dunkel. 1948. An Investigation of Second Language Teaching. Boston, Mass.: Ginn & Co.

AUSUBEL, D.P. 1968. Educational Psychology: A Cognitive View. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

_____ 1967. Learning Theory and Classroom Practice. Bulletin No. 1. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

BRITISH COUNCIL. 1979. Information Guide No. 2: English for Specific Purposes. London.

BROOKS, N. 1960. Language and Language Learning. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

BUROS, O.K. (Ed.) 1975. Foreign Language Tests and Reviews. Highland Park, N.J.: The Gryphon Press.

CARROLL, J.B. 1968. The Psychology of Language Testing. In A. Davies (Ed.) Language Testing Symposium. London: Oxford University Press.

_____ 1961. Fundamental Considerations in Testing for English Language Proficiency of Foreign Students. Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

_____ 1953. The Study of Language: A Survey of Linguistics and other Related Disciplines in America. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

_____ 1952. An Appraisal of Language Tests from the Standpoint of the Psychology of Language. Yearbook of the National Council on Measurements Used in Education, 1951-2, 9.

CHASTAIN, K. 1976. Developing Second Language Skills: Theory to Practice. Second Edition. Chicago: Rand McNally.

CHOMSKY, N. 1966. Linguistic Theory. In R.G. Mead (Ed.) Report of the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Menasha, Wisc.

_____ 1965. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Cambridge: Massachussetts Institute of Technology Press.

CLARK, J.L.D. 1972. Foreign Language Testing: Theory and Practice. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.

CORDER, S.P. 1967. The Significance of Learner's Errors. International Review of Applied Linguistics. Vol. 5, No. 4.

COSTE, D., J. Courtillon, V. Ferenczi, M. Martins-Baltar, E. Papo, CREDIF and E. Roulet. 1976. Un niveau-seuil. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

COUNCIL OF EUROPE. 1979. A European Unit/Credit Scheme for Modern Language Learning by Adults. Report of the Symposium organized by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany at Ludwigshafen-Am-Rhein, 7 - 14 September, 1977. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

COUNCIL OF EUROPE. 1973. Systems Development in Adult Language Learning. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

COWAN, J.R. (Ed.) 1977. Special Issue on Language for Special Purposes: Studies in Language Learning. Vol. 2, No. 1, Fall 1977. Urbana-Champaign, Ill.

DAVIES, A. 1978. Language Testing, Part I and II. Language Teaching and Linguistic Abstracts. London: Cambridge University Press.

_____ (Ed.) 1968. Language Testing Symposium. A Psycholinguistic Approach. Language and Language Learning Series 21. London: Oxford University Press.

DIALOGUE CANADA II, Part II. 1976. Language Bureau. Ottawa: Public Service Commission.

DI PIETRO, R.J. 1971. Language Structures in Contrast. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

HAMP, E.P. 1968. What Contrastive Grammar Is Not, If It Is. In J.E. Alatis (Ed.) Georgetown Round Table. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

HARRIS, D.P. 1969. Testing English as a Second Language. New York: McGraw-Hill.

HYMES, D. 1972. On Communicative Competence. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds.) Sociolinguistics. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

INGRAM, E. 1968. Attainment and Diagnostic Testing. In A. Davies (Ed.) Language Testing Symposium. London: Oxford University Press.

KELLY, L.G. (Ed.) 1969. Description and Measurement of Bilingualism. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

KETTERING, J. 1974. Communication Activities. Pittsburgh: English Language Institute.

LADO, R. 1967. Language Testing: The Construction and Use of Foreign Language Tests; A Teacher's Book. London: Longmans.

_____ 1964. Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill

_____ 1950. Measurement in English as a Foreign Language with Special Reference to Spanish-speaking Adults. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Michigan.

LAMBERT, W.E. and G.R. Tucker. 1972. Bilingual Education of Children: The St. Lambert Experiment. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

MACNAMARA, J. 1973. Nurseries, Streets and Classrooms: Some Comparisons and Deductions. Modern Language Journal 57. 5-6 September/October.

_____ 1966. Bilingualism and Primary Education: A Study of Irish Experience. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

MORROW, K.E. 1980. Communicative Language Testing: Revolution or Evolution? In C. Brumfit and K. Johnson (Eds.) The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching. London: Oxford University Press.

_____ 1977. Techniques of Evaluation for a Notional Syllabus. (Study commissioned by the Royal Society of Arts.) Center for Applied Language Studies. Reading: University of Reading.

MOULTON, W.G. 1961. Linguistics and Language Teaching in the United States. 1940 - 1960. In C. Mohrman, A. Sommerfelt and J. Whatmough (Eds.) Trends in European and American Linguistics. 1930 - 1960. Utrecht: Spectrum.

MUNBY, J. 1978. Communicative Syllabus Design. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

NEWMARK, L. 1971. A Minimal Language Teaching Program. In P. Pimsleur and A. Quinn (Eds.) The Psychology of Second Language Learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

NEWMARK. L. and D.A. Reibel. 1968. Necessity and Sufficiency in Language Learning. International Review of Applied linguistics. Vol. 6. No. 2.

PAULSTON, C.B. 1974. Linguistic and Communicative Competence. TESOL Quarterly. Vol. 8. No. 4.

PILLINER, A.E.G. 1952. The Application of Analysis of Variance to Problems of Correlation. British Journal of Statistical Psychology. Vol. 5, No. 31.

POLITZER, R.L. 1964. The Impact of Linguistics on Language Teaching: Past, Present and Future. Modern Language Journal No. 48.

QUINE, W.E. 1960. Word and Object. Cambridge: Massachussetts Institute of Technology Press and New York: Wiley.

RICHTERICH, R. and J.L. Chancerel. 1978. Identifying the Needs of Adults Learning a Foreign Language. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

ROBINSON, P. 1980. English for Specific Purposes (ESP.). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

ROBINSON, P. 1975. Oral Expression Tests. English Language Teaching 25.

ROULET, E. 1976. Présentation et guide d'emploi pour "un niveau-seuil." Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

SAVIGNON, S.J. 1972. Communicative Competence: An Experiment in Foreign Language Teaching. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.

SELINKER, L. 1972. Interlanguage. International Review of Applied Linguistics. Vol. 10. No. 3.

SKINNER, B.F. 1957. Verbal Behaviour. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

SPOLSKY, B. (Ed.) 1978. Approaches to Language Testing. Advances in Language Testing Series:2. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

_____ 1976. Language Testing: Art or Science. Paper read at the Fourth International Congress of Applied Linguistics 1975. In: Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress of Applied Linguistics 1975. Stuttgart, Germany. Stuttgart: HochschulVerlag.

_____ 1969. Reduced Redundancy as a Language Testing Tool. Paper read at the Second International Congress of Applied Linguistics. Cambridge, England.

SWAIN, M. (Ed.) 1972. Bilingual Schooling: Some Experiences in Canada and the United States. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

TRIM, J.L.M. 1980. Developing a Unit/Credit Scheme of Adult Language Learning. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

UPSHUR, J.A. 1971. Productive Communication Testing: Progress Report. Paper presented at the Second International Congress of Applied Linguistics. Cambridge, England. In G. Perren and J.L.M. Trim (Eds.) Selected Papers of the Second International Congress of Applied Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____ 1962. Language Proficiency Testing and the Contrastive Analysis Dilemma. Language Learning No. 12.

VALETTE, R.M. 1967. Modern Language Testing - A Handbook. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

VAN EK, J.A. 1980. Waystage English. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

_____ 1976. The Threshold Level for Modern Language Learning in Schools. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

_____ 1975. The Threshold Level in a European Unit/Credit System for Modern Language Learning by Adults. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

WILKINS, D.A. 1976. Notional Syllabuses. London: Oxford University Press.